|    | Case 2:20-cv-02268-KJM-JDP Documer  | nt 22 Filed 08/02/22 Page 1 of 2                                 |
|----|---|--|
| 1  |   |  |
| 2  |   |  |
| 3  |   |  |
| 4  |   |  |
| 5  |   |  |
| 6  |   |  |
| 7  |   |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 10 |   |  |
| 11 | JOHN PARLANTE,  | Case No. 2:20-cv-02268-KJM-JDP (PS)                              |
| 12 | Plaintiff,  | ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  |
| 13 | v.  | SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LOCAL |
| 14 | AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE,   | RULES  |
| 15 | Defendant.  | ECF No. 19   |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 | On July 6, 2022, defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 19. To date,                |  |
| 18 | plaintiff has not filed a response to the motion.   |  |
| 19 | Under the court's local rules, a responding party is required to file an opposition or              |  |
| 20 | statement of non-opposition to a motion no later than fourteen days after the date it was filed.    |  |
| 21 | E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(c). To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet       |  |
| 22 | certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to      |  |
| 23 | comply with its orders or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon  |  |
| 24 | Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d      |  |
| 25 | 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a |  |
| 26 | duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. See             |  |
| 27 | Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.                         |  |
| 28 |   |  |
|    |   | 1  |

## Case 2:20-cv-02268-KJM-JDP Document 22 Filed 08/02/22 Page 2 of 2

1 The court will give plaintiff the opportunity to explain why sanctions should not be 2 imposed for failure to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion. 3 Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and 4 will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. 5 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that: 6 1. The August 11, 2022 hearing on defendant's motion for summary judgment is 7 continued to September 8, 2022, at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom No. 9. 8 2. By no later than August 25, 2022, plaintiff shall file an opposition or statement of non-9 opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment. See ECF No. 19. 10 3. Plaintiff shall show cause, by no later than August 25, 2022, why sanctions should not 11 be imposed for failure to timely file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's 12 motion. 13 4. Defendant may file a reply to plaintiff's opposition, if any, no later than September 1, 14 2022. 15 5. Failure to comply with this order may result in a recommendation that this action be 16 dismissed for lack of prosecution, failure to comply with court orders, and failure to comply with 17 local rules. 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 20 Dated: August 1, 2022 21 JERÉMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 22 23

24

25

26

27

28